opening of a panel of a said at least one end wall and side wall is adjacent to the ceiling of the enclosure.

BX

16. A security locker as in claim 11 wherein there are ventilation openings in the opposing side and end walls at substantially the same height.

REMARKS

This submission is in response to the Official Action dated October 3, 2002.

Claims 1-10 are pending.

Claim 5 has been amended to provide a proper antecedent basis for the panels. Therefore, the §112 rejection of claims 5 and 7-10 has been overcome.

Main claim 1 and claims 2 and 3 of the application have been combined into a new main independent claim 11. Claim 11 brings out the feature of the invention that at least one of the end or side walls is formed by at least one panel that has spaced, opposing skins. In the at least one panel there is a ventilation opening formed by opposing in-line sections in the opposing skins. Each section of the skin has a plurality of openings. In essence, this is a grille.

As described at page 4, line 22 to page 5, line 2 of the Specification, the openings (42) of the section (40) (grille) in each opposing skin are in-line. Therefore, viewing into the interior of the enclosure is available on a direct view basis but viewing at an angle is restricted. As set forth in original claim 3, and as shown in Fig. 6, the openings 42 can be

Serial No. 09/865,027 Response to Office Action dated October 3, 2002 M:\2193\1G456US1\MOB0071.WPD;1 Docket No. 2193/1G456US1

offset from each other. This further restricts th view into the security enclosure. The in-line

version of the grille openings is set forth in claim 12, which depends from claim 11, and the

offset version is in claim 13, which also depends from claim 11.

Original claim 1 was rejected over Gavin, et al., U.S. 4,843,788. This patent

does not teach or suggest a side wall or end wall of a panel of spaced parallel skins. That is,

Gavin uses solid side and end walls for his enclosure. Therefore, the type of ventilation

opening set forth in claim 11 is not taught or suggested by the patent and claim 11 is

patentable thereover.

Claims 1-3 and 5 were rejected as anticipated by British publication 22,471

(Bendall). Bendall does show an enclosure with a wall panel with parallel skins. As described

at page 2, lines 7-10, the purpose of Bendall's structure is to form an air chamber C between

the skins. Further, as described at page 2, lines 42-44, air enters the chamber C through an

opening at the lower part of the outer skin, and flows upwardly through the interior chamber C

to exit through openings C¹ at the upper part of the inner skin. This is unlike the structure of

the invention wherein there is a ventilation opening formed by an opposed in-line sections.

Each of the sections in the opposing skins has a grille effect formed by the plurality of

openings, whether in line or offset. As explained above, this arrangement has a decided

advantage. Accordingly, new main claim 11 patentably distinguishes over Bendall and should

be allowed. Claims 12 and 13, which depend from claim 11, also should be allowable for the

reasons given above.

Claims 4 and 7-9 were rejected as unpatentable over Bandall. Claims 7-9, and

Serial No. 09/865,027

Response to Office Action dated October 3, 2002

M:\2193\1G456US1\MOB0071.WPD:1

Docket No. 2193/1G456US1

Page 6

new claim 14, are now directed to the structure of the ceiling panels as shown in Figs. 6 and

6A. These claims all ultimately depend from new main claim 11 and therefore are patentable.

Claims 6 and 10 are rejected over the combination of Bendall in view of Melane,

et al., U.S. 6,039,414. Melane was cited for the teaching of an equipment mounting station.

Claims 6 and 10 ultimately depend from new main claim 11. The addition of Melane does not

overcome the deficiency of the principal reference to Bendall. Therefore, claims 6 and 10 are

allowable.

Claims 15 and 16 have been added. These claims depend from claim 11 and

recite further features of the enclosure. Therefore, they also should be allowable.

The other art cited has been considered and is not deemed pertinent.

In view of the above amendments and remarks, it is respectfully requested that

the application be reconsidered and that all pending claims be allowed and the case passed

to issue.

If there are any other issues remaining which the Examiner believes could be

resolved through either a Supplemental Response or an Examiner's Amendment, the

Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number

indicated below.

Serial No. 09/865,027

Response to Office Action dated October 3, 2002

Docket No. 2193/1G456US1

Page 7

Prompt and favorable action is requested.

Respectfully submitted,

S. Peter Ludwig

Reg. No. 25,351 Attorney for Applicants

DARBY & DARBY, P.C. Post Office Box 5257 New York, NY 10150-5257 Phone (212) 527-7700